

**REMARKS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the remarks and analysis contained in the Office Action. Applicant requests reconsideration of this application where claims 1-20 are now pending. The amendments to claims 9 and 14 are clerical in nature and have no relationship whatsoever to any rejection against any claim.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 based upon the *Kim* reference. That reference does not include a radio at a remote location from a backplane. The optical transmitters 104 are part of active couplers 100 that are placed immediately adjacent slots in the electrical backplane 80 and in the front of the optical backplane 30. Column 7, lines 8-10, teaches that active couplers 100 “are preferably attached to and operably connected with respective slots 82 and disposed immediately adjacent to waveguiding plate 32.” Column 8, lines 26-29, teaches that the, “Active couplers 100 in cooperation with diffractive optical elements 110 and waveguiding plate 32 function as board-to-board or component-to-component interconnectors.” These teachings are not consistent with the Examiner’s interpretation of the *Kim* reference. An active coupler that is immediately adjacent a backplane cannot be interpreted to be a radio at a remote location. Further, a board-to-board interconnector is not a radio at a location remote from a backplane. There is no anticipation.

None of the claims can be considered obvious over the *Kim* reference and Applicant respectfully traverses all rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 based upon the *Kim* reference. Even if the *Kim* reference could be modified as suggested by the Examiner, the result is not the same as the claimed invention for the reasons mentioned above.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 based upon the *Medved, et al.* reference. That reference does not teach a radio at a remote location from a backplane. The

elements 38L are not radios but are optical transmitters. Further, the transmitter 38L is not fairly interpreted as being at a remote location from a backplane. Figures 1 and 2 from that reference teach relatively compact devices containing components such as those shown in Figure 2. It is not a fair or reasonable interpretation of the reference to construe an optical transmitter 38 within a device as shown in Figure 1 as a radio at a remote location from one of the network interface devices 58 in the *Medved, et al.* reference.

With regard to claim 3, the index lenses and collimators of *Medved, et al.* are not the same as a backplane card. Therefore, the element 68 in the *Medved, et al.* reference cannot reasonably be interpreted as a backplane card. The language "transparent to" on page 2, line 14 of Applicant's specification does not in any way suggest that a backplane card is a lens or a collimator. Rather, that language is intended to mean that the backplane operates as if a backplane card was not there. In other words, the backplane card does not alter the operation of the backplane in the example embodiment described at that portion of page 2.

None of the claims are anticipated and none of them can be considered obvious. There are significant differences between the arrangements recited in Applicant's claims and those in the references cited in the most recent Office Action.

Applicant respectfully submits that this case is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes that additional fees in the amount of \$120.00 are required for a one month extension of time. A check in the amount of \$120.00 is enclosed. The Commissioner is

authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1482 in the name of Carlson, Gaskey & Olds for any additional fees or credit the account for any overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

**CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C.**



David J. Gaskey  
Registration No. 37,139  
400 W. Maple Road, Suite 350  
Birmingham, MI 48009  
(248) 988-8360

Dated: April 26, 2005

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that the enclosed **Response** is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on April 26, 2005.

  
Theresa M. Palmateer

N:\Clients\LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES\IP00018\PATENT\Response 4-26-05.doc